



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/158,029	11/26/93	ETI EPP	R PRD007

PAUL C. SCIFO  
233 BROADWAY  
SUITE 4703  
NEW YORK, NY 10279

E3M1/0326

AMSBURY, EXAMINER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2302	14
DATE MAILED:	03/26/96

Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.

Commissioner of Patents

*See attached.*

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	<b>08/158,029</b>	<b>Filepp et al</b>
Examiner	Group Art Unit	
<b>Wayne Amsbury</b>	<b>2307</b>	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Wayne Amsbury (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Paul C. Scifo (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Mar 22, 1996

Type:  Telephonic  Personal (copy is given to  applicant  applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No. If yes, brief description:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Agreement  was reached.  was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: n/a

Identification of prior art discussed:

n/a

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant requested an after-final interview, submitting an agenda addressed to an amendment of claim 6 and to the Examiner's advisory action of 2/27/96 which denied entry to the amendment on the grounds that it changed the scope of claims 6-11. It is noted that the amendment was submitted on same date 1/29/96 as Appeal Brief #11, and the advisory action was mailed on same date 2/27/96 as Examiner's Answer #13. The Examiner's position with respect to the change of scope remains firm, and the amendment would clearly not put claims 1-15, all rejected under 102(b) and unresolved 112,2d issues, in condition for allowance.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1.  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2.  Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

  
**WAYNE AMSBURY**  
 PATENT EXAMINER  
 GROUP 2300

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.